

**AREA PANEL THREE – UPDATE REPORT**

**FOR 19 JANUARY 2005**

**ST JAMES CENTRE, MALCOLM STREET**

**Area and Neighbourhood Unit**

**Sarah Edwards, Area Panel Manager, telephone 255636**

**Vickie Butler, Information and Communications Officer, telephone 258529**

**Minicom 01332 258522**

---

## CONTENTS PAGE

Community Issue	Page No.
1. Ref: 303045 – Baseball Ground, Leacroft Road – raised 17.09.03 .....	3
2. Ref: 304012 – Unauthorised change of use at 51, Mount Street - received 17.03.04 .....	5
3. Ref: 304029 – Waste technology - received 14.07.04 .....	6
4. Ref: 304030 – DRI –Reduction in Health Hopper Bus Service route- received 14.07.04 .....	7
5. Ref: 304031 – Railings – Mount Carmel Street - received 14.07.04 .....	9
6. Ref: 304034 – Traffic issues – Normanton and Pear Tree - received 14.07.04 .....	10
7. Ref: 304038 – Graffiti in Crompton/ Gerard Streets - received 08.09.04 .....	12
8. Ref: 304039 – Concern about rubbish and lack of litterbins on Cathedral Green - received 08.09.04 .....	14
9. Ref: 304042 – Pavement improvements on Buller Street - received 08.09.04 .....	16
10. Ref: 303053 – Removal of telephone boxes in the City - received 19.11.03 .....	17
11. Ref: 304048 – Area Panel Papers - received 10.11.04 .....	18
12. Ref: 304049 – Draft Licensing Policy - received 10.11.04 .....	20
13. Ref: 304050 – Railings, St Chads Road and Whittaker Road - received 10.11.04 .....	21
14. Ref: 304051 – Hartington Street Renewal Area - received 10.11.04 .....	22
15. Ref: 304053 – Railings, Crompton Street - received 10.11.04 .....	23
 <b>Petitions</b>	
16. Ref: 303044 – Petition - One way system for Stockbrook Road and Westbury Street – raised 17.09.03 .....	24
17. Ref: 304027 – Petition - Molineux Street – one way street - received 12.05.04 .....	26
18. Ref: 304045 – Petition - Raven Street - requesting a one-way system received 08.09.04 .....	27
19. Ref: 304047 - Petition – Activ8 Project, Mount Carmel Street- received 08.09.04 .....	28
20. Ref: 304054 – Petition - Renal Street and Avondale Road – request for a one-way system to improve traffic flows - received 26.09.04 .....	29
21. Ref: 304055 – Petition - Dexter Street – request for parking, street lighting and drainage improvements- received 26.09.04 .....	30

**1. Ref: 303045 – Baseball Ground, Leacroft Road – raised 17.09.03**

Issue

A member of the public raised the issue of restricted access to rear gardens adjacent to Shaftsbury Road. Parking problems had been created due to no waiting restrictions and residents had received parking fines as a result.

- Councillor Kalia assured the resident that the parking restrictions are being considered urgently and that, once an official order to remove them is received; the restrictions could be taken away.
- Inspector Parkin agreed to look into why residents had received parking tickets, sometimes in the early hours of the morning. He pointed out that this might have been due to road safety issues. He agreed that the restrictions at the Baseball Ground needed to be looked at, as it was not officially the football site any longer.
- David Gartside, Head of Traffic assured those present that because of the issues that residents had raised, the review of parking restrictions in the area had been brought forward.

January 2004

A review of the existing waiting restrictions covering the area around the former football ground is taking place in order to amend the restrictions to take into account the change of use in the area.

Proposals are currently being considered to:

- retain a number of the 'at any time' restrictions -double yellow lines on the grounds of junction safety and to ensure adequate carriageway width for access by larger vehicles and through traffic
- remove the 'no waiting restrictions' between the hours of 10am and 6pm on Saturdays and between the hours of 6pm and 10pm on Wednesdays between 1 August and 31 May' as there is no longer a need to maintain an emergency access route to the former football ground
- retain the - no waiting restrictions from Monday to Saturday between the hours of 8am and 6pm in Portland Street on the east side to ensure the free flow of traffic during the day which will help to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the traffic signals junction.

These proposals are subject to consultation with the Police, councillors and other statutory consultees.

March 2004

There is a three-week consultation period legally required for Traffic Regulation Orders. Officers will ensure that three-week period is co-ordinated to enable members of the public to view the plans at one of the planned Area Panel 3 meetings. Details will also be provided at the meeting on how people can object to the proposals. The initial meeting with police has yet to take place so it is not yet known when the consultation period will be, but the Area Panel will be kept informed of progress.

May 2004

It was reported that it is taking some time to gather the necessary information due to the size of the area. Officers are currently gathering information to draw up a detailed proposal to deal with the historic parking restrictions associated with the Baseball Ground.

A number of the 'at any time' restrictions -double yellow lines are likely to be retained on the grounds of junction safety and to ensure adequate carriageway width for access by larger vehicles and through traffic. It will be proposed that the Wednesday and Saturday restrictions associated with the football ground are removed, as there is no longer a need to maintain an emergency access route to the former football ground.

Action reported at the meeting on 10 November 2004

It was reported that the Football Parking Order was introduced to restrict parking in residential streets by people attending matches at the Baseball Ground Matches took place on Saturdays and Wednesdays and the restrictions reflected these days and the times hence the 10am to 6pm Saturday

and 6pm to 10 pm Wednesday restriction between 1 August and 31 May. The order also restricts parking between 8 am and 6 pm Monday to Saturday and no waiting at any time-double yellow lines around certain junctions.

Since the Derby County football stadium has been relocated and the Baseball Ground has been demolished there is no longer a need for any parking restrictions associated with football matches. The proposal is to remove all of the restrictions associated with the football ground - 10 am to 6 pm Saturdays and 6 pm to 10 pm Wednesdays between 1 August and 31 May.

The 'football match' restriction is to be removed on one side of Portland Street therefore it is felt necessary to retain the 8 am to 6 pm restriction on the opposite side to allow free flowing traffic on what is a busy road.

An officer has attended a meeting with residents, at which the police were also present to discuss general traffic concerns in the Pear Tree area. The proposed alteration to the waiting restrictions was discussed at this meeting. Consultation has been carried out with Ward Councillors. No further information/details have gone out at this stage.

Statutory consultation on the proposed amendments to waiting restrictions is currently taking place with the emergency services and road haulage associations. It is anticipated that the proposals will be advertised for public comment - on street and in the local press - by the end of the year.

It is proposed to close this item on condition that officers in Development and Cultural Services keep the Panel informed about the arrangements for further public consultation.

Public response at the meeting on 10 November 2004
--

None.

Council response at the meeting on 10 November 2004
---

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 10 November 2004
---

The panel agreed to close this item on condition that officers in Development and Cultural Services keep members informed about the arrangements for further public consultation.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 19 January 2005
---

Two new petitions have been received from residents at Leacroft Road. One is a further request for financial support for housing improvements and the other is a request for support to improve off-road parking facilities at the rear of the properties.

Responsibility
----------------

Nicola Weekly, Traffic Manager, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 716074  
Martin Gadsby, Private Sector Housing Manager, telephone 255236

**2. Ref: 304012 – Unauthorised change of use at 51, Mount Street - received 17.03.04**

Issue

Concern was raised about the Apples Garage, on Mount Street/Mill Hill Lane being turned into 'Floors to go'. A major retail organisation it has enormous lorry deliveries at least three times a week. There is also a forklift truck that goes on the pavement. This has been reported to the planning department – who say that this is an unauthorised change of use, as they do not have planning permission. It has also been reported to the police about when the lorries are there. This is a major junction and local residents feel that something needs to be done.

Action reported at the meeting on 10 November 2004

It was reported that on 15 September 2004 the planning enforcement officer had a meeting with a representative from Floors 2 Go. They discussed the current unauthorised use of the premises and the Council's raised concerns regarding the suitability of such a use in this location.

The representative gave assurances that a retrospective planning application would be submitted within 28 days of the meeting. The representative was made aware that enforcement action would be commenced if no application was forthcoming. Residents were informed of the outcome of the meeting via e-mail on 29 September 2004.

As of 29 October, no application had been received. The DCC Enforcement Officers are now seeking legal advice on pursuing enforcement action.

Public response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

A member of the public raised concern that if a retrospective application is received then the Council will consider it, which does not seem right.

Council response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

Councillor Burgess stated that the Council was acting within the requirements of planning law.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 10 November 2004

None.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 19 January 2005

A letter was received from a Chartered Surveyor in Birmingham to advise the Council they are in the process of preparing a planning application on behalf of Floors 2 Go. They hope to be in a position to submit the application by the end of November -subject to meeting with a planning officer.

Despite this, officers have continued with the enforcement process. The Legal section was instructed to commence enforcement proceedings at the end of October 2004. Legal have serving Section 330 "request for information" notices on all interested parties prior to serving the actual Enforcement Notice.

No planning application has been received yet, but the Floors 2 Go's agents met with officers to discuss their proposed planning application on 7/1/05 prior to submitting it. They indicated that the application will be submitted within the next two weeks.

Should a planning application be received either before a potential Notice is served or before the last date of compliance stated within such a Notice, then all enforcement action will be put into abeyance whilst the planning application is determined.

Responsibility

Laurence Rayner, Planning and Enforcement Assistant, Development and Cultural Services,  
telephone 255947

### 3. Ref: 304029 – Waste technology - received 14.07.04

#### Issue

A resident asked if the council was aware that the SWERF technology does not work and neither does the Waste Recycling group technology? She also asked if the councillors interested in this or do they want to give taxpayers money to large companies for no reason?

#### Action reported at the meeting on 10 November 2004

Officers have confirmed that planning approval was given for the development of a waste recycling facility on Sinfin Lane on 14 May 2002. Copies of the plans and details of the application are available for public inspection at the reception in Roman House. This item will now be closed.

#### Public response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

A member of the public asked what had happened to the WRG application, and how it was progressing. A written question was also submitted which asked for the PFI costs of the projected plan, as opposed to the current costs on the WRG application to be made available at the next meeting.

#### Council response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

Sarah confirmed that the information would be sent to the resident. She also informed the meeting that the papers are available for public inspection at Roman House.

#### Actions agreed at the meeting on 10 November 2004

To ask the officer to contact the resident directly regarding the WRG application.

#### Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 19 January 2005

WRG's application was granted permission on 10 April 2003. Papers are available for public inspection at Roman House. The approval is still valid.

Issues surrounding the performance of the technology behind the proposed waste plant were debated extensively at the application stage. The Council's waste strategy takes account of the environmental performance of the various technologies available for managing waste. There is therefore no further comment that can be made.

#### Responsibility

Colin Stewart, Contract Development Officer, Streetcare and Waste Management, telephone 715071  
Paul Clarke, Group Leader – Planning, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 255935

**4. Ref: 304030 – DRI –Reduction in Health Hopper Bus Service route- received 14.07.04**

Issue

A member of the public read out the following question:

*“The Derbyshire Royal Infirmary has recently announced that their car parks are too small, not long after having slashed the Health Hopper routes and services. The service does not run through Normanton anymore, which is one of the most deprived areas. What is the Council doing - if anything - about expanding the Health Hopper service so that it runs through as many areas and suburbs of Derby as possible, as the DRI surely has a Green Travel Plan, which the Council is supposed to be assisting the Health Authority with and the Primary Care Trust, together with the City Council has recently issued a policy to improve the health of the community through having regard to air quality issues”.*

Action reported at the meeting on 10 November 2004

It was reported that bus services in Derby are largely commercial operations, over which the City Council has little or no control. The former Health Hopper was never commercially viable, but it did receive a substantial subsidy from the Health Trust. This funding was provided as part of the Trust's review of acute health service provision in the city.

In April the service was withdrawn and replaced by a lower frequency service running between the two hospital sites and calling at limited stops on a more direct route between the hospitals. The former Health Hopper followed a tortuous route through many areas, which resulted in its attractiveness for hospital links being very low, and the costs of operation high.

The revised route resulted in some areas losing their direct links to the City General Hospital. These include parts of Normanton and Littleover.

The deregulation of bus services was introduced by the Transport Act 1985. In simple terms, this allows any bus operator to introduce a bus service if it feels there is a commercial opportunity. It also places a duty upon local transport authorities to consider the introduction of supported services where there is an identified socially necessary service that is not provided by the commercial bus network.

Discussions have been held with some bus operators, following the concerns raised by the area panel and other local people. However at the current time, no expression of interest in providing a commercial service has been made. The Council's budget for supporting bus services will not stretch to providing the substantial amount of support that would be required for a non-commercial bus service, so at the current time there is no prospect of a bus route providing a direct link between Normanton and the City General Hospital.

Officers will continue to negotiate with bus operators to try to find an affordable solution to the problems. Further updates will be provided when there is progress to report.

Public response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

A member of the public asked how much revenue the Council receives from car parks and other parking charges, and what percentage of this, if any is put towards subsidising the four bus services.

Council response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 10 November 2004
---

To provide an update at the next meeting.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 19 January 2005
---

Revenue from car parks and/or parking charges are not ring-fenced to be used directly to support local bus services. However, as income from car parking and parking charges forms part of the Council's revenue, indirectly funding for bus services do benefit.

Martin Marples has been asked to provide information about revenue from car parking.

Responsibility
----------------

Pete Price, Transport Policy Manager, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 01332 715034



**5. Ref: 304031 – Railings – Mount Carmel Street - received 14.07.04**

Issue

A resident raised concerns about dangerous railings on the steps at Mount Carmel Street – there is a piece missing, and one dangerous piece. This was initially reported 3 years ago and residents feel that they are no nearer to getting these replaced. They are not asking for a replacement just a repair.

Action reported at the meeting on 10 November 2004

It was reported that an order has been issued to repair the damaged handrail that goes up the steps. The repair itself needs to be carried out by a blacksmith but it should be completed at the latest by Friday 12 November.

Public response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

A member of the public confirmed that an Officer had been to look at the railings. He said that no work has started on site yet.

Council response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

Sarah Edwards asked the resident to let her know if the work has not been completed by Friday 12 November and gave a commitment to follow this up if necessary.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 10 November 2004

None.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 19 January 2005

The missing piece of railing was replaced at the end of November but resident have report that the loose railing at the Burton Road end of the steps remains defective.

The Maintenance Contractor has informed the City Council that they have booked the blacksmith to carry out these works on the 11 January 2005.

Responsibility

Stewart Corbett, Highway Manager, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715008.

**6. Ref: 304034 – Traffic issues – Normanton and Pear Tree - received 14.07.04**

Issue

A resident raised concern over the bad traffic congestion problems within the area, and commented that there was no room to increase access for traffic. This also affected the air quality. She asked the panel what the Council were doing to apply the Road Traffic Reduction Act of 1997.

Action reported at the meeting on 10 November 2004

Officers in Development and Cultural Services have agreed to provide two short reports in response to these issues:

- tackling traffic congestion in Normanton and Pear Tree – see separate item on November 2004 agenda
- a general response on Road Traffic Reduction – this will be provided at a future meeting.

David Gartside presented a report, which considered the issue of traffic congestion in Normanton and Peartree. It concluded that congestion on Normanton Road is not caused by volume of traffic. Normanton Road is a vibrant and active shopping area and as such it attracts a lot of activity such as deliveries, parking and bus services, which creates the congestion.

The report stated that the Council had approached businesses along Normanton and Peartree Road about deliveries some years ago. At that time, the small businesses had reported that they needed to have many deliveries each day and that they could not control delivery times or the type of vehicles used. They suggested that the introduction of restrictions on loading and unloading could create real problems for some people.

The Council is moving forward with the introduction of Decriminalised Parking Enforcement. It is hoped that in early 2006 the Council will become responsible for enforcing parking restrictions and it will be Council employed wardens who help keep our roads free of unnecessary parking. This may help us to target enforcement and reduce the problems that inconsiderate parking creates. We have also earmarked resources from our Local Transport Plan to address transport issues in district centres.

The Council has recently started to work to improve Allenton Shopping Centre and will in the future be turning our attention to other district centres including Normanton Road and Pear Tree Road. This will allow us to look at the provision of facilities, including car parking, as part of a wider review. Due to funding commitments and priorities it is unlikely that we would be able to undertake this work within the next two years.

Public response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

A member of the public asked for clarification about when the report on the road traffic reduction would be presented. Another resident requested that this report should include information on air quality and high emissions.

Another member of the public raised concerns about Paks Food Store car park off Pear Tree Road. He reported that cars do not give way to traffic turn right across the traffic and suggested that there should be a 'no right turn' sign erected to improve traffic flows.

Another member of the public asked for appreciation to be given to both Inspector Parkin and David Gartside for their efforts with this issue. She also expressed her agreement with Councillor Hussain regarding the slowness of buses in the area, stating that they are too large for the road. She asked if the bus companies could be asked to use their smaller buses on this route.

Council response at the meeting on 10 November 2004
---

Sarah Edwards confirmed that an update report regarding road traffic reduction would be provided at the January 05 meeting.

There was a lively debate about the report and David Gartside answered a number of questions that were raised by resident and members of the panel.

Councillors Hussain and Khan raised concerns that the comparisons with traffic flows on Osmaston and Nottingham Road contained in the report. Cllr Hussain stated that the perception in the area that since the last improvements were done the traffic congestion has got worse.

Councillor Nath commented that following works carried out in 1993, the installation of parking spaces on Normanton Road, now add to the traffic problems. He stated that the worst stretch on the road was the mini roundabout at Normanton Road and Pear Tree Road. The flow of traffic is not smooth in that area, and needs to be properly managed.

David Gartside agreed that the problems have got worse, and stated that Normanton is in fact very different to any other area in the city. He stated that this was not helped by people's behaviour. With regard to air quality, he acknowledged that this is a big issue wherever there is stationary traffic. He suggested that if more people walked, then this issue would improve.

He agreed that smaller buses on the road may be more economical and more suited to the road, but explained that this was a decision for the actual bus company.

With regard to delivery times, he explained that in 1993, they had discussed this issue with the businesses on Normanton Road, but unfortunately they did not get consensus. He explained that the Council could introduce restrictions on delivery times, but indicated that if any objections were received, the Council would more than likely lose, due to the nature of the businesses.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 10 November 2004
---

Councillor Burgess agreed that this is addressed in the future.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 19 January 2005
---

The issues raised about air pollution are huge and extend far beyond Normanton and Pear Tree. The current Local Transport Plan, and its review, which is currently underway, seek to develop and deliver an integrated system that reduces congestion, improves accessibility, minimises impact on the environment, and enhances safety.

It is not possible to provide a more specific response to the question about road traffic reduction. However, extensive consultation was undertaken in October to help identify priorities for the next LTP. The results of this consultation show that people recognise there is a need to tackle four broad priorities, including congestion, safety, accessibility and the environmental impacts of transport. As the five year programme is developed for the period 2006 to 2011, we will be consulting further with people in Derby and we will also use the area panels to gauge opinions and views on the types of schemes we are putting forward.

The Council is aware of the problems of congestion and delays caused by the customers of Pak foods when accessing the car park. Whilst the Council's traffic engineers understand the reason why residents have suggested banning the right turn they have written to the resident to say that they do not feel that this action would solve the problem. They are concerned that drivers would continue to make this turn, bringing other right turn signs into disrepute or, park in less appropriate locations, as there is no easy alternative route to access the car park for traffic approaching from the south.

Responsibility
----------------

David Gartside, Head of Traffic– Highways, Transportation and Waste, telephone 715025.

Pete Price, Transport Policy Manager, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715034.

**7. Ref: 304038 – Graffiti in Crompton/ Gerard Streets - received 08.09.04**

Issue

Mr Woodward raised concerned about the graffiti on Crompton Street. He has spoken to the Council about this, but was told that it is the landlord's problem as it is private property. In areas such Crompton Street, Gerard Street and the alley way in Marks and Spencer this is becoming a bigger and bigger problem. He is aware that the Council are under funded in this area and unless the graffiti is racist they do not have the resources to remove it. He asked the Council to supply advice on its removal.

Action reported at the meeting on 10 November 2004

Richard Winter from StreetCare has spoken to Chris Woodward from Crompton Street about an incident of Graffiti at the junction of Gerrard Street and Crompton Street. The property in question is a private property. The only solution for removing the graffiti is to paint over it, because the wall is a painted render. We have written to the owner but have had no reply from them. Anyone who contacts the Council for advice is given it freely. We are currently investigating ways in which we could increase the amount of graffiti removal on Private Property. The problem is identifying who owns property that has got graffiti on and getting them to take some action about it. It is often the case that each graffiti job must be examined before work can take place, no one solution fits all.

A key target for the Anti-social Behaviour Team and partner agencies is graffiti. A recent notable success is the targeting of the tagger known as 'drops'. He has been made subject to a three-year anti-social behaviour order prohibiting him from being in possession of paint materials in public, not to cause graffiti or cause alarm, harassment and distress.

Richard Winter gave a short presentation about litter, graffiti and recycling issues.

Public response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

Following the presentation, concern was raised that graffiti was not being removed from private properties. One resident stated that a resident on Margaret Street was advised by the Council that they could not remove the graffiti as it was on private property, but did not advise her on what products to use. As a department they should point people in the right direction.

Another resident stated that there was also a lot of graffiti on the green telephone boxes on the street, and explained that these were prime targets for posters and graffiti. She asked if there was anything written in the contracts with them, that they have to be responsible for them.

Another resident asked why only one set out of three graffiti signatures near to Gerrard Street/Burton had been cleaned off.

Reference to problems on the jitty on Empress Road was also mentioned.

Council response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

Richard Winter agreed that officers can advise residents of where to purchase specialist cleaners.

With regard to the telephone boxes, the Utilities Companies are responsible for them.

He stated that there had been problems on Burton Road with the blends of paint used. The removers that the council use are not reacting to them. He stated that a company from Newcastle would be making a visit the following week.

With regard to the jitty on Empress Road, Richard confirmed that this had been partially cleaned during the year, and letters sent to the owners asking permission to paint over it. Unfortunately not all the owners had responded so the council could not clean the whole wall.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 10 November 2004
---

None.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 19 January 2005
---

To close this item following the January meeting. The Council will continue to work with the owners of the properties on the Empress Road jitty to try to get an agreement to remove the graffiti on the walls.

Responsibility
----------------

Richard Winter, Streetcare and Waste Management, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 716352

**8. Ref: 304039 – Concern about rubbish and lack of litterbins on Cathedral Green - received 08.09.04**

Issue

Louise During, a resident of North Parade raised concern about Arboretum Ward. When she took friends to Cathedral Green the area was covered in rubbish. She contacted her local councillors to raise her concern and to request that some litterbins are erected.

Action reported at the meeting on 10 November 2004

It was reported that the Council has a duty under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (EPA) to keep its public highways and relevant land clear of litter and refuse, so far as is practicable. A Code of Practice issued under section 89, defines national cleansing standards and gives practical guidance to authorities. A copy of the code can be found at [www.defra.gov.uk/environment/localenv/litter/code](http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/localenv/litter/code)

The Code of Practice defines various zones. Those that relate to Derby are as follows:

Zone One = Town centres, major transport centres, shopping centres, central car parks, other busy public places.

Zone Two = High density residential areas (terrace), busy recreational areas, suburban car parks, industrial estates with a high density of premises.

Zone Three = Low density housing (detached/semi-detached), other transport centres, industrial estates with a low density of premises, high technology business parks.

Zone Six = Strategic routes.

In Derby, Zone One areas are the City Centre, Pear Tree Road, Normanton Road and various district shopping centres including Mickleover and Allenton. Normanton, California, Markeaton and roads in the immediate vicinity of the station are Zone Two. Everywhere else is Zone Three. The main routes in and out of the City run through a number of zones but are primarily Zone Six.

The Code of Practice also defines various grades of cleanliness as follows:

Grade A = no litter or refuse

Grade B = predominantly free of litter or refuse apart from small items

Grade C = widespread distribution of litter and refuse with minor accumulations

Grade D = heavily littered with significant accumulations

The zoning system provides local authorities with guidance on how quickly a road needs to be cleansed in order to return it to Grade A standard. For example, if a road in Zone 3 falls below Grade B, the Code of Practice states that it must be restored to Grade A standard within two weeks. This information, in conjunction with local knowledge about the cleanliness of a particular road or area, enables the Council to determine the frequency of cleansing. Other factors are also included in the decision-making process, such as how regularly pedestrians use a road, as litter tends to be generated more frequently by pedestrians than by people in cars. Frequency of cleansing varies according to the particular road and can be anything from daily to weekly, or even every eight weeks.

Richard Winter gave a short presentation about litter, graffiti and recycling issues.

Public response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

None.

Council response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 10 November 2004

None.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 19 January 2005

An inspection undertaken by on 7 December revealed no litter on the grassed area in question. As there are already 4 litter bins located on the paved area to the front of the grass, the Parks Section do not consider that additional litter bins are necessary.

The area of grass does not form part of the highway and is maintained by the Parks Section of Commercial Services. As such, it may not be included for litter clearance under the current street cleaning contract. However, Commercial Services will become responsible for street cleaning services in March 2005 and will improve the co-ordination of street cleaning services with other grounds maintenance. In the meantime, the Park Ranger service will be asked to monitor the area for litter.

Responsibility

Ian Wheatley, DCC Parks, Commercial Services, telephone 716530

**9. Ref: 304042 – Pavement improvements on Buller Street - received 08.09.04**

Issue

Greg Jackson, resident of Buller Street, is against the proposed pavement improvement as it makes the street too narrow and the kerbs too high. As he is in a wheelchair he has been promised a drop kerb to enable him access to his property, but this is only OK if no body parks in front of it. If they do he will have to go to the end of the block in order to get access. Fran Fuller, also from Buller Street added that parking is diabolical, she has written to Chris Williamson raising concerns that the kerbs will be too high when they are replaced and stated that she would also like to see white markings on the road.

Action reported at the meeting on 10 November 2004

It was reported that Mr Jackson has been contacted regarding a request for a disabled persons' parking bay. Social Services have already visited Mr Jackson and completed an application form, which is on its way to us. One the highway assessments have been made then Mr Jackson will be contacted.

An officer from Development and Cultural Services will contact the other resident who raised concerns about the height of the new kerbstones.

Public response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

None.

Council response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 10 November 2004

To ask Development and Cultural Services to contact the other resident who raised concerns about the height of the new kerbstones and to let the area panel manages have a copy of the response.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 19 January 2005

Response awaited.

Responsibility

Nicola Weekly, Traffic Manager, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 716074  
Stewart Corbett, Highway Manager, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715008.



## 10. Ref: 303053 – Removal of telephone boxes in the City - received 19.11.03

### Issue

Concern was raised in November 2003 about the perceived reduction in the number of public telephones in the City.

BT Payphones is currently reviewing the provision of payphones throughout Great Britain. The work is being undertaken in several phases over an 18-month period. In a recent letter to the Council stated that they remain *'committed to maintaining a quality public payphone network and meeting our Universal Service Obligations by the adequate provision of payphones across Great Britain. We will not leave any community without a payphone service regardless of the profitability of such payphones.'*

BT has initially identified a number of payphones for removal, which are losing money due to low usage and have an alternative payphone nearby. It is understood that they would normally post a notice in the payphone to mark the beginning of a 42-day consultation period.

If any member of the public is concerned about BT plans to remove a payphone they should contact BT and quote the phone number and location of the kiosk in their correspondence.

This item was closed following the meeting in March 2004 and re-opened following the meeting in September 2004.

It was reopened in September 2004 and BT were invited to attend a future area panel meeting to provide an update on the latest position with their rationalisation programme.

### Action reported at the meeting on 10 November 2004

It was reported that the Area Panel Manager contacted BT on 1 October 2004 and invited them to attend a future area panel meeting.

### Public response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

None

### Council response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

None

### Actions agreed at the meeting on 10 November 2004

None

### Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 19 January 2005

It is suggested that this item should now be closed as BT have not responded to the request to attend an area panel meeting.

### Responsibility

John Stewart, Planning, Development and Cultural Services. Telephone 255934  
Rick Thompson, Project Liaison Office, BT Payphones, PP 06A21, Delta Point, Wellesley Road, Croydon, CR9 2YZ. Telephone: 0800 252 745. Email: [btp.authorisation.team@bt.com](mailto:btp.authorisation.team@bt.com)

**11. Ref: 304048 – Area Panel Papers - received 10.11.04**

Issue

Chris Woodward asked that the changes in the way the Council distributes the meeting papers be raised as a late item in the meeting.

Action reported at the meeting on 10 November 2004

New item.

Public response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

Concern was expressed by a member of the public that the change to the distribution of agendas was a retrograde and undemocratic step and that the cost savings quoted were incorrect. Downloading papers from the internet was considered to be both difficult and time consuming. Residents present at the meeting supported this view. They considered that it was inappropriate to treat panels in the same way as other Council meetings as they are public meetings that have been specifically set up for residents to attend.

Another resident stated that they need to receive the agenda in advance to be able to prepare for the meeting, and was very disappointed that this was not going to continue. One resident explained that the panel would not be following meeting procedures, by not providing the papers, and stated that the papers should be available in any media.

With regard to the process of other Council meetings, a resident stated that she understood that the area panels are public meetings, and without the public the Councillors would not need to attend. It is therefore a very different meeting to other Council meetings.

A show of hands was taken and there was unanimous support in favour of full copies of the agenda being made available on request, free of charge to anyone who wants them either by post, electronically or by collection from the Council House.

Council response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

Councillor Dhindsa agreed with the suggestion, stating that the panel do not want to lose people, and should therefore give those people who are interested in the meeting a free copy of the papers.

Councillor Nath explained that the success of the area panels had been phenomenal, and was concerned that if a decision is taken at this stage not to send papers out, then people would not be prepared, and this would go against the reason they were set up in the first place. He stated that the papers should be sent out to those people who are interested in the meeting, and who specifically ask for them. With regard to the internet, he confirmed that improvements will be made, but explained that it could take some time for people to download a 100 page document.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 10 November 2004

The Panel resolved to recommend to Council Cabinet that full copies of the agenda should be made available, on request, free of charge by post, electronically or by collection from the Council House.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 19 January 2005
---

A motion was considered by the full Council on November 24 to reinstate the original process for the distribution of agenda papers. Council agreed to amend the motion to make 40 copies of each agenda available free of charge for collection by individuals at the Council House. One copy for each person will be available on a first come served basis. Anyone attending the area panel meeting will receive a copy if the allocated 40 sets have not all been distributed prior to the meeting. In future the list of community issues contained in the update report and the names of funding applications and projects will be included on the agenda that is distributed to everyone on the area panel database. Copies of the agenda and papers can also be viewed or downloaded from the Council website at [www.derby.gov.uk](http://www.derby.gov.uk)

Responsibility
----------------

Jason Spencer, Constitutional and Electoral Services Manager, telephone 255466

## 12. Ref: 304049 – Draft Licensing Policy - received 10.11.04

### Issue

Chris Woodward asked the panel about the progress of the City's draft licensing policy. He explained that the consultation period finished in October, but had not heard anything. He asked that a report be brought to the next area panel explaining the policy, how it will be implemented, and the effects it will have on licensing hours and applications for new pubs and clubs.

### Action reported at the meeting on 10 November 2004

New item.

### Public response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

### Council response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

Councillor Burgess explained that the Council's room for manoeuvre is limited, as it is written in law.

### Actions agreed at the meeting on 10 November 2004

To arrange for an officer from Licensing to attend the meeting, or to provide a full report on this.

### Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 19 January 2005

The Council's final draft licensing policy was approved by Full Council on 24 November 2004 following the consultation period. The approved policy will be published before 6 January 2004. Mr Woodward will receive a copy of the policy directly as he has requested one.

The policy broadly sets out how the Council will deal with applications received under the Licensing Act 2003. Each individual application for a new licence or licence variation will be considered on its own merits.

Any 'interested parties', such as local residents and businesses, will be able to make representations to the Council when new applications or variations to existing licences are made.

Notification of these applications will be made in the local press and in notices displayed on the premises concerned. As part of their application, each applicant will be required to demonstrate how they intend to meet four 'licensing objectives' These are: preventing crime and disorder, protecting public safety, preventing public nuisance and protecting children from harm. Any representations made must relate to one or more of these objectives, otherwise they will not be accepted.

Following these representations, a licensing panel hearing made up of councillors must take place. Interested parties will be able to put their views to the licensing panel before it makes a decision on the application.

### Responsibility

Mike Kay, Environmental Services, telephone 716340

**13. Ref: 304050 – Railings, St Chads Road and Whittaker Road - received 10.11.04**

Issue

A member of the public raised concern over the damaged railing around the small garden at the junction of St Chad's Road and Whittaker Road. These railings were paid for by the area panel, but are now in a horrible state of disrepair. She asked if any action was to be taken on this, as she had been informed previously by the Council that they were waiting for insurance details to come through, before any repairs could be carried out.

Action reported at the meeting on 10 November 2004

New item.

Public response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

Council response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

Councillor Burgess confirmed that he was aware of this, and would ask for an update to be provided at the next meeting.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 10 November 2004

To provide an update at the next meeting.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 19 January 2005

This is a Highway issue and not covered by the Council's Maintenance Contract. and we have had to obtain quotes to follow standing order. We will be in a position shortly to issue an order to repair the damage railings. These works should be completed by the end of January.

Responsibility

John Edgar, Maintenance Manager, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715067

**14. Ref: 304051 – Hartington Street Renewal Area - received 10.11.04**

Issue

A member of the public asked for more information on where neighbourhood renewal is, with regard to Leopold and Hartington Street. She informed the panel that the owner of the Taj Mahal restaurant on Normanton Road had constructed a large corrugated outbuilding on Leopold Street, but she had never seen an application. She also raised concern over a property that had been bricked up by the Council over a year ago, and to date, nothing further has happened with it.

Action reported at the meeting on 10 November 2004

New item.

Public response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

Council response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

Actions agreed at the meeting on 10 November 2004

To arrange for an officer to attend the next meeting, and provide a report on the Hartington Street renewal area.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 19 January 2005

Martin Gadsby will arrange for an officer to attend the March 2005 area panel meeting to provide a briefing.

Responsibility

Martin Gadsby, Private Sector Housing Manager, telephone 255236

**15. Ref: 304053 – Railings, Crompton Street - received 10.11.04**

Issue

A local resident informed the panel about the hazardous railings in front of the apartments on Crompton Street. He explained that last winter he had held onto them in the icy weather and cut his hand. This has been raised before, but no action taken.

Action reported at the meeting on 10 November 2004

New item.

Public response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

Council response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

Councillor Burgess asked the resident to give full details of the location.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 10 November 2004

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 19 January 2005

This site was inspected following the area panel meeting. The inspector agreed that they are dangerous as the railings are adjacent to a public footpath -and on a slope with the curved tops positioned at waist height -for an adult.

It would appear that when the railings were painted, paint runs were left and have now formed small, extremely sharp projections on the underside.

The subcontractor who undertook the painting was asked to file down any sharp edges on the 29/11/04.

Responsibility

Julie Eyre, Local Manager, Derby Homes, telephone 716550.

**16. Ref: 303044 – Petition - One way system for Stockbrook Road and Westbury Street – raised 17.09.03**

Issue

A member of the public presented a petition to the Panel in September 2003 asking for a one-way system between Westbury Street and Stockbrook Road. He felt that this would prevent accidents and that near misses were a daily occurrence. This was causing pollution, noise and general disturbance for local residents.

**November 2003**– Council officers provided a response to the petition following their investigation into the request for a one-way street. At present, traffic using Westbury Street and Stockbrook Road is required to negotiate parked vehicles and to give way to oncoming traffic. This reduces vehicle speeds and to some extent deters drivers from using these roads as a through route. Site observations indicate that two-way traffic, including the 33-bus service negotiates the parked vehicles on Stockbrook Road safely. Given that both Stockbrook Road and Westbury Street form part of a wider network of roads, it was felt that a one-way system on Stockbrook Road and Westbury Street would push all the morning peak and afternoon peak hour traffic onto adjacent streets.

In addition, both streets currently have good safety records, according to Derbyshire Constabulary's database of all recorded personal injury accidents; there were no personal injury accidents on either Stockbrook Road or Westbury Street over the three years to July 2003. It was therefore not considered appropriate to introduce a one-way restriction that may lead to increased vehicle speeds and have an adverse impact on neighbouring residential streets. The petitioners and ward councillors were not satisfied with this response and asked for further investigations to be undertaken.

**January 2004** - Following further investigations, the Director of Development Services still considered that there was little benefit in terms of road safety of introducing a one-way restriction on these streets. Further, as a scheduled bus service operates in both directions on Stockbrook Road, the adverse effects on public transport of complying with this request could lead to a public inquiry. This is a further significant reason for refusing the request. However, given the strength of residents' opinion, it was suggested that further consultation would take place to determine how to proceed.

**March 2004** - In February 2004, 154 questionnaires were distributed to all residents living in properties fronting Westbury Street, Stockbrook Road and Westbury Court were invited to complete a questionnaire stating whether or not they supported the introduction of a one-way restriction. A total of 60 responses were returned, a response rate of 39%. Based on these responses, the results of the consultation was:

- 28 residents supported the suggestion of introducing a one-way restriction and 19 residents were opposed.
- The number of positive response to the questionnaire represents 18% of the properties surveyed.
- It appeared that a significant number of residents did not feel the need to express a view.

**May 2004** - The Panel resolved to request the Director of Development and Cultural Services to investigate the feasibility of introducing a one-way system for Stockbrook Road and Westbury Street.

**July 2004** - Cabinet resolved that further consultation about the need for a one-way restriction should be carried out at Stockbrook Road and Westbury Street.

Action reported at the meeting on 10 November 2004

It was reported that all residents were invited to take part in a consultation exercise in a letter sent out to them on 9 September 2004. The results of this consultation exercise will be reported back to Cabinet on the 21 December 2004.



Public response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

None.

Council response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 10 November 2004

To note that the results of the consultation would be reported to Council Cabinet on the 21 December and to provide a report on the findings at the January 2005 area panel meeting.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 19 January 2005

The request for a one –way restriction on Stockbrook Road and Westbury Street was referred to the Council Cabinet by Area Panel 3. The panel felt that initial consultation with residents was flawed. Council Cabinet supported this view and asked for a further consultation exercise to be undertaken.

The results of the second consultation were reported to Cabinet on the 21 December 2004. The results showed that of those who responded 36 residents supported the one-way proposal, 26 residents were opposed and a further 6 residents had no view either way. Approximately 40% of residents completed the consultation. The consultation letter made it clear that a nil response would be counted as a negative one.

Given that the consultation did not demonstrate a clear majority of residents in favour of a one-way street, Cabinet decided that no further action would be taken in this matter.

Responsibility

Tara Nield, Traffic and Parking Engineer, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 7150256.

**17. Ref: 304027 – Petition - Molineux Street – one way street - received 12.05.04**

Issue

Residents of Molineux Street presented a petition asking the Council to take steps to reduce traffic congestion. They say that the volume of traffic and parking on both sides of the street is making driving conditions virtually impossible. They have requested that the street is made one-way with traffic flowing down Molineux Street from Rosehill Street.

In July 2004 it was reported that as the Council had also received a request to make Wilfred Street one-way, this request would be considered together with Wilfred and Sale Street. This will require a detailed investigation including vehicle counts and speed surveys. Due to a high number of similar requests, and in order to avoid doing these counts during school holidays, it is likely that this investigation will take place in September.

Action reported at the meeting on 10 November 2004

It was reported that the traffic management work programme for 2004/5 included Wilfred Street - request for a one-way design and consult. Therefore the request for a one way in Molineux Street was added to this study in conjunction with a request for Sale Street as they are all in the same area. It is important to include other roads in the area, as the implementation of a one-way system would have implications for adjacent streets.

Public response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

None.

Council response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 10 November 2004

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 19 January 2005

See separate report on agenda – item 9.

Responsibility

Neil Palfreyman, Traffic Management Engineer, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 716090.

**18. Ref: 304045 – Petition - Raven Street - requesting a one-way system received 08.09.04**

Issue

The council received a petition signed by 117 residents in August 2004. It concerned the installation of a one-way system and the lead petitioner was invited to present a petition to the area panel on 8/9/04.

*'We the undersigned residents are concerned about the traffic problems in Raven and Percy Streets and therefore petition the Council to create a one-way system using these two streets, for the benefit of all.'*

Action reported at the meeting on 10 November 2004

It was reported that investigation work has begun and traffic surveys have been ordered.

Public response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

None.

Council response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 10 November 2004

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 19 January 2005

See separate report on agenda – item 9.

Responsibility

Neil Palfreyman, Traffic Management Engineer, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 716090.

**19. Ref: 304047 - Petition – Activ8 Project, Mount Carmel Street- received 08.09.04**

Issue

A petition was received about anti-social behaviour of residents in the Activ8 Project on Mount Carmel Street. This has been referred to the Council's Housing Strategy Unit and to the Chief Executive of Stonham Housing Association.

Action reported at the meeting on 10 November 2004

It was reported that an officer from Stonham Housing Association has already made contact and done some work with Councillor Hussain and the lead petitioner. A full response to the petition will be provided at the January 2005 meeting of the area panel.

Public response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

None.

Council response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

None.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 10 November 2004

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 19 January 2005

The housing association has met with local residents to discuss the petition. They are working together to try to find mutually agreeable arrangements that will provide sustainable solutions to the problems outlined in the petition.

Responsibility

Ian Fullagar, Housing Strategy and Performance Manager, Housing Strategy Unit, telephone 255185

**20. Ref: 304054 – Petition - Renal Street and Avondale Road – request for a one-way system to improve traffic flows - received 26.09.04**

Issue

The Council received a petition signed by 31 residents in September 2004. It concerned the installation of a one-way system to improve traffic flow and the lead petitioner was invited to present a petition to the area panel on 10/11/04.

The petition has been referred to the Director of Development and Cultural Services to provide a full response at a future area panel meeting.

Action reported at the meeting on 10 November 2004

None.

Public response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

A member of the public stated that it would be very difficult for emergency services and dustbin lorries to gain access, due to the parking on the street.

Council response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

Councillor Burgess stated that there was no law stopping people parking on the street, unless there are double yellow lines.

Councillor Hussain confirmed that there was a very sharp bend at the end of Renal Street, and stated that the location did merit proper investigation.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 10 November 2004

Traffic management to provide a report at the next meeting.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 19 January 2005

See separate report on agenda – item 9.

Responsibility

Neil Palfreyman, Traffic Management Engineer, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 716090.

**21. Ref: 304055 – Petition - Dexter Street – request for parking, street lighting and drainage improvements- received 26.09.04**

Issue

The Council received a petition signed by 35 residents in September 2004. It concerned a request for a number of improvements, which the signatories feel that they would benefit from including:

- extra lighting
- a no-parking zone at the end of the street – so turning vehicles around will not be a problem
- double glazing to block out noise caused by passing trains
- improvements to sewage pipes – nearly all cellars within Dexter Street have water coming in from the damaged sewage pipes, giving rise to damp, and mouse infestation.

The petition has been referred to the Director of Development and Cultural Services to provide a full response at a future area panel meeting and the lead petitioner is invited to present a petition to the area panel on 10/11/04.

Action reported at the meeting on 10 November 2004

None.

Public response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

A member of the public asked the panel where they were at with this petition. Another resident commented about the few streets on Osmaston road suggesting that the council give this area an uplift.

Council response at the meeting on 10 November 2004

Councillor Burgess informed the residents that the sewage pipe issue should be referred to Severn Trent.

Sarah Edwards confirmed that the petition had been passed on to Development and Cultural Services, who are currently investigating this issue. She explained that a full response would be available at the next meeting in January.

Councillor Khan informed the panel that this petition was passed to him initially. Following discussions with officers, who agreed that extra lighting was required, had been told that it would cost in the region of £12,000. Unfortunately this cannot be funded in the current budget. He has also spoken to residents, and their main concern is with the parking, and the lack of turning space at the end of the street. He confirmed that it was dangerous for drivers reversing their vehicles.

Actions agreed at the meeting on 10 November 2004

To provide a full report at the next meeting.

Updates on agreed actions to feedback to the meeting on 19 January 2005

See separate report on agenda – item 8 and general report about traffic management priorities at item 9.

Responsibility

Neil Palfreyman, Traffic Management Engineer, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 716090

John Edgar, Maintenance Manager, Streetcare, Development and Cultural Services, telephone 715067